



Liaison Committee Meeting No 11 14th July 2009

Present: Sean Quirke (SQ) Wicklow Co Co, Grainne McLoughlin (GMcL), Ciaran Hayden (CH) Greystones Chamber of Commerce; Kathleen Kelleher (KK) Greystones Town Council; Chris Maloney (CM) Greystones Town Council; Niall Ferns (NF) Harbour Users Committee; Sean Whooley (SW) Rathdown Park Residents Association; Marie Burbridge (MB) Redford Pk Residents Association; Emer Singleton (ES) Friends of Historic Rathdown; Tom Fortune (TF) Greystones Protection & Development Association; Mary Egan (ME) Harbour Residents Association;

Sispar: Paraic Keogh (PK) Brendan Sheehy (BS) Paddy O'Rourke (POR) Catherine Rogers (CR) Imelda Shanahan (IS) TMS Environmental Seamus Sorohan (SS) Sisk-Lagan JV; Noel Burke (NB) Sisk-Lagan JV

Apologies: Derek Mitchell (DM) Greystones Town Council.

SQ opened the meeting and welcomed the newly elected representatives to the committee.

The minutes of Meeting no 10 were accepted with the following amendment:

- 1) ME wished to note that DM's suggestion that Sispar soundproof homes had been rejected, some discussion ensued as to whether local residents had refused this. ME stated that PK of Sispar had rejected this possibility.

Programme Development Status

BS discussed progress to date advising that both North & South breakwaters have progressed well and works to the roundheads has commenced. An aerial photograph taken on 25th May was circulated. BS advised that the area of the clubhouse buildings is being used for storage the focus will be on this area for the remainder of the year until the bulk of the breakwater blocks in storage here have been used. GMcL queried whether this means further delay on starting works to the clubhouse buildings. BS replied that as this area is the only access point, critical marine works must take priority. Commencement of works to the clubhouse buildings is under constant review. GMcL noted that the clubs will not have carried out any maintenance to their current buildings and this would need to be communicated to them. Sispar advised that this is done at the Harbour Users Meetings.

Environmental Monitoring

IS discussed the Blue Flag Status of Bathing Water at Greystones was discussed and it was noted that in 2007 the Environmental Protection Agency analysis of bathing water at Greystones was noted to be of "sufficient" quality while in 2008 it was noted

by the Environmental Protection Agency as being of “good” quality. It was queried whether there is a statutory requirement to test the water quality. IS responded that the EPA carry out testing on the South Beach & TMS test the north beach as it is not a blue flag beach. Results are communicated to the Local Authority, which collates the information.

The report on environmental monitoring was given with a full copy covering the months April, May & June handed out. It was requested that a synopsis be made available on the website, this was agreed.

ME asked for details of the non-site related activities that had caused exceedances on the noise monitoring reports and enquired as to whether these could be made available in advance. BS advised that the information in the reports is the most up to date available and the reports are usually issued just prior to the Liaison meetings. ME stated that she was surprised that the noise created was within limits. BS stated that the monitoring is carried out by a professional company and that individual noise complaints are not very frequent or in high numbers. ME went on to say that the noise of the generator at night is still an issue. TF stated that residents have issues which are not being dealt with. SQ advised that the committee was the forum to bring these items to Sispar’s attention and that every effort is being made to identify and address the issues raised. SQ advised that any nighttime exceedances would be evident on the monitoring reports. IS continued by saying that once a complaint is received that data is checked and site is questioned on activity at the time. This is all compiled and issued to the complainant. It was questioned whether any feed back is give to complainants. BS advised that feedback was given.

ME stated that despite assurances from Sispar that incidents of noise generation have been investigated and dealt with there is still an issue. It was agreed that a representative from Sispar would arrange to meet with ME at a time to be agreed in order to resolve.

IS explained the process in relation to noise monitoring & limits, first the limit or breach is examined, the type of noise is identified and then the cause is identified and attenuated. This is the procedure followed on foot of ME’s complaint and the source could not be found. PK stated that where a noise was identifiable it has been dealt with where practicable. This particular noise is a humming sound, which seems to be continuous even when there is no site activity. Serious attempts had been made to identify the sound but it is not being picked up on instruments This needs to be put into context, it is not a case of Sispar ignoring residents and it should be acknowledged that when Sispar agree to take a course of action it is being followed through. IS suggested that in order to make the process more transparent Sispar might consider reporting on the number of complaints and enquiries received in the preceding period at the next meeting. BS agreed that this would be helpful and will be prepared for the next meeting.

TF queried the finishing time for construction workers, SQ responded that for tidal works the finish time is midnight, TF questioned how long this would continue SS answered this would be the case until winter. SS went on to say that only certain critical operations are carried out during the night shift i.e. work vulnerable to weather if left in a temporary state or operations which can only be carried out at low tide. ME stated that she was not happy with work continuing beyond 7pm and marine works need to stop at 9pm. PK advised that cognisance of this had been taken and as a result

of communication with local residents work now stops at 12 midnight. The permitted noise levels are very prescriptive and are being worked within.

MB raised some queries as follows:

1. Can the filling of hoppers be carried out later in the morning?
2. Residents felt there was not enough notice given regarding the beach closure for Nourishment
3. Birds had been nesting at the left hand side of the gap bridge – what had happened
4. Could the squeaky crane be oiled?
5. Will the beach be returned to the original surface?
6. Refuted rumours of Redford Park residents seeking an injunction

SQ responded that a revetment is to go in at the old landfill site. MB queried whether this would help with erosion further up the beach. PK responded that the beach nourishment programme would slow down rate of erosion. MB pointed out that the beach has retreated quite a bit SQ explained that the beach material is being re-used. SS advised that the sand martins returned to nest in the cliffs after the beach nourishment went in. Sean Whooley queried what the plans are for access at the gap bridge. SQ responded that access to the beach will be provided in this location but there are difficulties with breaching works in the long term.

CH requested clarification on the byelaw regarding jet skis. SQ replied that while jet skis can be launched & retrieved, no jet skies are allowed within 50m of the beach. It was acknowledged that some members of the public had been ignoring signage & abusing security, BS advised that while it is not Sispar responsibility to police the area, in future security personnel would call the Gardai. CH went on to say that there is little the Gardai can do in these circumstances and that the bye law is a grey area, is there a possibility of adopting a similar rule as exists in Kilmore Quay. SQ stated that there is already signage in place but that this is being ignored, the council could amend the bye-law and recommended this matter be brought to the attention of the area committee. CH advised that the Gardai were to issue tickets but that this is yet to happen.

ME advised that she would welcome more notice of piling activity than was previously given. GMcL requested the website be brought up to date, BS agreed.

SW queried the frequency of the Committee meetings SQ advised that they are normally held every 2 months but there are logistical difficulties with September. Enquiries comments or complaints do not have to wait until the next meeting but can be reported to the Liaison Officer either by leaving a message on the enquiry line or by visiting the office.

Next meeting to be held Tuesday 6th October 2009 after the Harbour Users in the Public Liaison Office

